DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 207 200 EA 013 987

TITLE	Corporal Punishment in the Schools.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Dept. of Education, Toronto.; Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities, Toronto.
PUB DATE	81
NOTE	91p.; Background paper prepared by Ministry of Education staff.
AVAILABLE FROM	Ontario Government Bookstore, 880 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario M7A 1N8 Canada ($3.00).
JOURNAL CIT	Review and Evaluation Bulletins; v2 n1 1981
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Corporal Punishment; *Discipline Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; Moral Issues; Political Influences; Public Opinion
IDENTIFIERS	*Canada

ABSTRACT

A continuing dichotomy in public opinion concerning the use of corporal punishment in Canadian schools provided the impetus for this paper, which includes a review of the relevant literature. Morality issues surrounding corporal punishment are discussed and public opinion data are exerpted from the Provincial Review of School Disciplinary Policy and Practices, in which parents, teachers, and students were surveyed regarding their attitudes and opinions concerning disciplinary practice. The results indicate that the use of corporal punishment has led to a high probability of adverse effects on students, and involves serious legal, ethical, and moral questions. The first of three appendices presents a precis of local newspaper coverage on corporal punishment policy formation in which public opposition resulted in the rejection of corporal punishment in those districts. The second appendix summarizes the Rutter report on the effect of secondary schools on student attitudes. The final appendix presents exerpts from Derek Wright's "Psychology of Moral Behavior" in which student/staff relations are examined on the basis of their impact on the moral development of students. (JEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

REVIEW AND EVALUATION BULLETINS

Volume 2, Number 1
1981

Corporal Punishment in the Schools

ED207200

EA 013 987

Ontario Ministry of Education
Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B.M. Hildebrand

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Corporal Punishment in the Schools

Background Paper
Prepared by Ministry of Education Staff

Hon. Bette Stephenson, M.D., Minister
Harry K. Fisher, Deputy Minister

© The Minister of Education, Ontario, 1981
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario

Ministry of Education Cataloguing in Publication

Corporal punishment in the schools. --
(Review and evaluation bulletins / Ontario Ministry of Education ; v.2, no.1)

1. Corporal punishment - Ontario.

I. Ontario. Ministry of Education.

II. Ontario. Ministry of Education. Review and evaluation bulletins ; v.2, no.1

ON01975 371.542 UTLAS: 54014604

ISSN 0226-7306

ISBN 0-7743-6192-1

Additional copies may be ordered from:

Ontario Government Bookstore
880 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1N8

(mail orders)
Publications Centre
880 Bay Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1N8

(Cheques should be made payable to the Treasurer of Ontario.)

or

Publications Sales
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

(Cheques should be made payable to OISE.)

Introduction

The issue of corporal punishment in the schools has been a contentious subject for many years. Despite the fact that majority general opinion appears to support its use, highly respected figures have consistently spoken against it. Because of this continuing dichotomy in public opinion and because of a lapse of 13 years since the last Ministry statement, it was felt that the subject should again be reviewed.

As a consequence of this review, the Minister has proposed that Ontario Regulation 704/78 be amended to require that teachers, in disciplining pupils, refrain from the use of force except to protect themselves or other pupils.

Because of the general interest in this subject and to illustrate the rationale on which the proposal is based, the Deputy Minister has requested that the internally prepared staff paper written in conjunction with this review should be published. Summarized in this document but published separately in full is a Provincial Review Report on School Disciplinary Policy and Practices which was also a part of this re-examination of policy.

November, 1980

Revised April, 1981

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN THE SCHOOLS

Background Paper Prepared by
Ministry of Education Staff

	Page
Introduction	iii
Corporal Punishment in the Schools - Summary Paper	1
Corporal Punishment in the Schools - Notes on The Moral Component	15
Corporal Punishment - Attitudes Reflected in the Literature and General Comments	25
Summary of Findings Regarding Opinions on Corporal Punishment and Discipline -- Excerpted from the Provincial Review of School Disciplinary Policy and Practices	47
Appendix A - Precis of Local Newspaper Coverage on Corporal Punishment in Schools - January 7 to May 6, 1980.	
Appendix B - Summary of Conclusions - Rutter, M. et al, Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children (1979).	
Appendix C - Excerpts from Wright, Derek The Psychology of Moral Behaviour (1971).	

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN THE SCHOOLS

Summary Paper

Because of a number of incidents which have been widely reported and commented upon by the press a review of the desirability of the use of corporal punishment in schools was undertaken.

A survey of the literature relating to the use of corporal punishment in schools was done by the Research and Evaluation Branch in the spring of 1979. In 1980, comments on corporal punishment as a moral issue were also developed by the Research and Evaluation Branch, and a provincial review of school disciplinary policy and practices was undertaken by Regional Services Division. This paper summarizes the major findings from the above, as well as other pertinent information.

The literature supports overwhelmingly the abolition of corporal punishment from schools for the following reasons:-

i) That corporal punishment is a deterrent for only a few children.

ii) That corporal punishment in the school may be only a continuation of the type of discipline in the home thereby reinforcing violence in the child.

iii) That corporal punishment is likely to lead to violent, negative, and antagonistic responses in children.

iv) That corporal punishment has little long term impact on behaviour, except perhaps a negative one, contrary to the fond memories of adults who recall having been strapped and "not been the worse" for it.

It is worth noting, however, that the bulk of the literature is hortative in nature; very little is based on empirical research or opinion surveys. Where there is research evidence, it is research from the context of families and of child-rearing and the consequences of punishment in the home. Much of the writing rests on assumptions about children's rights.

Indeed, the issue seems to be one that reflects the values of the protagonists in the debate, values which are often based on very fundamental but differing assumptions about human nature.

There is strong feeling in the literature, as well, about other forms of punishment - sarcasm, humiliation, ridicule, isolationism - in other words, any form of punishment that is destructive to a child's self-concept. Indeed, the point is sometimes made that such forms of punishment and many other aversive forms of behavior management may be more destructive than corporal punishment because of their impact on a child's self-image.

Only one province in Canada has banned the use of the strap in schools. Most take the view that the matter is one for local school board decision where, presumably, the values of the community may be reflected. The positions taken by the provinces are summarized below.

British Columbia - corporal punishment was banned by regulation in 1973. Section 14. - (1) of The School Act regulations states "The discipline in every school shall be similar to that of a kind, firm and judicious parent but shall not include corporal punishment."

Alberta - takes no stand - matter for local jurisdiction;

Saskatchewan - no official position;

Manitoba - the teacher shall maintain proper order;

Quebec - approves corporal punishment but the principal shall decide and keep a record;

New Brunswick - the teacher to practice such discipline...with advice and direction from the principal;

Nova Scotia - corporal punishment should be administered...as a last resort;

Prince Edward Island - it is the duty of every teacher to practice such discipline as would be...by parent, etc.;

Newfoundland - teachers are permitted to use corporal punishment;

In Ontario, corporal punishment per se is not mentioned in school law or regulations. The matter is touched on indirectly in the section of the Education Act dealing with the duties of teachers and the section of Ontario Regulation 704/78 dealing with the duties of pupils.

> Section 229(1)(e) of The Education Act, 1974:
>
> It is the duty of a teacher...to maintain, under the direction of the principal, proper order and discipline in his classroom and while on duty in the school and on the school ground.
>
> Section 230(a) of The Education Act, 1974:
>
> It is the duty of the principal of a school, in addition to his duties as a teacher...to maintain proper order and discipline in the school.
>
> Section 24(1)(c) of Ontario Regulation 704/78:
>
> A pupil shall...accept such discipline as would be exercised by a kind, firm, and judicious parent.

Significantly, in 1978, new language was added to Section 24(1)(b), A pupil shall..."exercise self-discipline."

In Memorandum 1968-1969:23 issued on December 6, 1968 the Ministry said "...it is considered that the use of corporal punishment in any form is not appropriate in the schools of Ontario and it is recommended that principals and teachers refrain from its use." The language, in impersonal passives and "recommended", can be considered as weak-kneed.

A preliminary survey of school disciplinary policy in February 1979, which led to a major provincial review of the issue in 1980, indicated that of the 90 boards responding, 47 had some policy in discipline but only three had prohibited corporal punishment. Of the 47, six were reviewing their policies.

In reviewing the policies of the boards, there are certain typical statements which appear and reappear in those which deal with corporal punishment.

.. That corporal punishment be used only as a last resort.

.. That only the "regulation" strap applied to the hands be employed.

.. That only the principal or vice principal may use the strap or that the principal's permission be required before the strap is administered by a teacher.

.. That a witness be present during a strapping.

.. That parents be consulted prior to the strap being used on a child.

.. That all cases of corporal punishment be recorded and the appropriate supervisory officer or the board be informed.

.. That a child not be strapped more than twice in a school year.

.. That corporal punishment is not appropriate as a disciplinary tool for a child in a special education program.

It is clear, even from these statements that school boards regard use of the strap as a last-resort punishment, a disciplinary measure which has to be controlled in its application. Nevertheless, that only three boards have banned use of corporal punishment indicates that most regard it as a necessary last resort.

The Provincial Review of Disciplinary Practices and Classroom Management was carried out in 1979-1980 using questionnaire surveys of parents, pupils, teachers, vice principals and principals. Ambiguity runs through the findings related to corporal punishment.

A total of 2043 parents returned questionnaires. Of these, 1199 approved use of the strap "if the principal feels it is appropriate"; 649 did not. The strap should be employed to punish "continual, deliberate defiance of school authority" (1066) and "as a last resort" (1014), for "stealing or vandalism" (749) or for "swearing or being rude to the teacher" (794). Yet of 178 parents reporting that their children had been strapped, 97 also said there had been either no effect or a negative one. In all 1500 parents viewed the strap as a deterrent, yet the anecdotal comments clearly support the view that the strap is ineffective and should have the lowest priority in disciplinary measures .

Student responses are also revealing: in all, 2267 participated. Only 379 felt the strap made pupils "behave better," 1177 stated it did not. About half, 1168, said that if the strap were taken out of the schoools, there would be no

difference in the number of discipline problems; a total of 644 responded that there would be more discipline problems and 233 predicted fewer problems.

Teachers also ranked the strap as having a very low effectiveness in discipline. Yet of the 925 teachers responding, 477 saw the strap as a last resort and 473 as a consequence for continual deliberate defiance of school authority," a result very similar to the feelings expressed by parents.

A possible conclusion from these findings is simply that the continued use of and support for corporal punishment is the result of adult frustration over how to deal with the worst behavior problems in schools. Seen in this light, corporal punishment survives because of the failure of discipline with some pupils. As a corrective measure it is seen as ineffective, a feeling confirmed by pyschological and sociological research findings that punishments have little deterrent effect in correcting behavior and are likely to have a negative one.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services through its child-abuse control program is concerned over the use of corporal punishment in schools. They see the continued unrestricted use of the strap in schools as an apparent legitimization of the use of force in dealing with children when such force cannot be used in disciplining adults. Accordingly, from the point of view of people concerned with that program, it would be wise to restrict the use of corporal punishment by provincial action if not abolish it altogether.

Most of the discussion on corporal punishment has focused on the legal issues.

.. the rights of the school and of the teacher to administer physical punishment as retribution for misbehavior

.. the rights of the child and whether or not children have civil rights similar to adults.

Corporal punishment is also a moral issue in that it is a reflection of society's attitudes towards its own members. In the context of the school, the use of corporal punishment, even as an ultimate disciplinary sanction, contributes to the moral tone of the school legitimizing the use of force in dealing with others. As a moral issue in schools, that issue should be examined in the light of our concepts of justice and of fairness in treatment of persons in a liberal democratic society.

To see the issue simply as a legal one raises questions of legality, punishment and retribution, and rights. As a moral issue, questions are raised about justice, fairness in treatment of others, and human worth and dignity. If the school is to have any moral authority it must transcend the legal issues to address the moral ones particularly because the school as an institution in dealing with teachers and pupils clearly conveys messages to the participants through their treatment by those with authority.

Research has established in examining home background situations the very clear relationship between violent punishment in the home and violent behavior outside the home because of the clear message to youngsters that violence and aggression are acceptable ways of dealing with other people. Derek Wright in The Psychology of Moral Behavior (1971) commented on

"...the association between delinquency and the high rate of physical punishment by parents.... Of course, it is an open question which is cause, which effect, though probably each is both a cause and an effect of the other; but we can safely conclude that physical punishment, particularly in the context of weak affection, does not reduce a child's general level of aggression. And it is not difficult to see why. Not only does physical assault provoke retaliatory aggression, but also the father is the child's chief model of how adults behave; and when he assaults his son, he is providing an excellent example of the very behavior he is blaming the child for."

Wright also raises the question of the moral influence of the school.

"If we wanted to know the nature of moral education going on in any school, our best strategy would be to seek the answers to five questions: What is the nature of the relationships between staff and pupils? What actions are rewarded or positively reinforced? What actions are punished or negatively reinforced? What is the nature of the example set by the staff? What kind of talking goes on in relation to morality?

It is worth noting in the context of these comments the findings of a study headed by M. Rutter and reported in Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children, a massive study of inner London schools aimed at finding through observation, the determinants of success in schools. This study found that pupil behavior was significantly worse in schools that used punishments frequently and that high levels of corporal punishment were particularly associated with the worst patterns of behavior. The study also found that where the school atmosphere was positive and

task-oriented, the behavior and the academic success of the pupils was significantly better even where children came from home and community backgrounds which were identical with the bad school situations.

> "The differences between schools in outcome were systematically related to their characteristics as social institutions. Factors as varied as the degree of academic emphasis, teacher actions in lessons, the availability of incentives and rewards, good conditions for pupils, and the extent to which children were able to take responsibility were all significantly associated with outcome differences between schools. All these factors were open to modification by the staff..."

The positive atmosphere of a school, the "ethos" as the researchers called it, made a difference. This moral tone included emphasis on work, positive reinforcement, reward for good work and behavior rather than punishment for poor work and misbehavior.

On both moral grounds and on the pragmatic level of how moral tone affects the success of the school, it is clear that a school which respects and supports the individual child is more likely to be successful than one which conveys a message of threats and punishment for non-compliance with the rules. The good school adopts, in effect, a moral stance in recognizing the individual worth and dignity of pupils, rewarding achievement and adopting a task-oriented approach to teaching and learning. This moral stance would surely be strengthened if the school rejected the use of physical force as a disciplinary measure.

The Options

If we are to remove the use of the strap from schools in Ontario or to put some control on its use, there are a number of possible courses of action.

It should be remembered that the foundation for use of corporal punishment is Section 43 of the Criminal Code, which is a federal statute.

> "It is lawful for every parent or person in place of a parent, schoolmaster or master, to use force by way of correction towards any child, pupil or apprentice under his care, providing such force is reasonable under the circumstances."

Any effort by a provincial jurisdiction to restrict corporal punishment in law will run into this impediment, an exemption in the Criminal Code of Canada.

Nevertheless it is still possible for the Ministry to act in order to state its policy in a positive way. The options for action may be summarized as below:

1. To amend The Education Act, Section 229, adding such language as "to refrain from the use of force in disciplining a pupil."

   There are variations which might be used, e.g., "undue force", "physical force" or the addition of a safeguard for teachers such as "in disciplining a pupil, to refrain from the use of force except to protect himself or other pupils".

   The language suggested is broad, more general than a restriction on corporal punishment or use of the strap, but that is the intent. It should be clear that even a casual strap as discipline is not acceptable.

2. To amend Regulation 704/78, Section 21 in a similar way.

3. To amend Regulation 704/78, Section 21, to require a teacher to exercise such disciplinary measures as are approved by the Board. Such a measure would then require school boards to formulate and adopt policy on school discipline and the amendment would have to be accompanied by a memorandum to school boards informing them that such a policy was necessary. This memorandum might then set out the requirements, from the Minister's point of view, of a desirable school board policy on discipline.

4. To send out a memorandum asking boards to make policy on school discipline. This memo might also set out Ministry standards for such a policy.

5. To send out a memorandum reiterating and strengthening the position taken in the 1968 Memorandum.

Consideration

In choosing a course of action there are a number of constraints.

The most important is the impact of such a step on "public opinion", the articulated viewpoint of newspapers, letter writers, and organized groups concerned with schools. It is worth noting that correspondence responding to The Toronto Star's anti-corporal punishment editorial of April 18, 1980 has been very divided. At a time when the state of discipline in schools is apparently the major concern about schools, any move to restrict the use of corporal punishment is likely to be seen by significant and vocal segments in our society, not least by many teachers, (although their federations are opposed to use of the strap), as a move to weaken disciplinary sanctions. Any move that is made must, therefore, involve some preparation of public opinion.

Any move should be taken after consultation with the key interest groups.

In moving to remove or restrict the use of corporal punishment as a disciplinary measure in serious circumstances, we should recommend and be seen as recommending some alternative approaches to the correction of pupil behavior. The great advantage of the strap is its apparent good short-term effect on pupils - not just the offender/victim - and its great convenience and low cost.

The Ministry's stance in removing or restricting the use of corporal punishment should rest on moral grounds -- both in its public image and in fact. The issue and decision regarding children's rights, if any, follows from the moral stance.

The moral stance to be articulated should emphasize the desire of the Ministry to strengthen the values of a free and democratic society by having schools project to pupils an atmosphere in which work, achievement, effort, and individual personal worth are recognized and where force has no place. A statement might clarify the desirable kind of school environment, perhaps based on the Rutter work.

There is a practical problem. How can the Ministry, except through exhortation, influence the classroom atmosphere? A commitment by boards and supervisory officers is necessary. Teachers in many schools where the socialization process has de-emphasized the value of positive reinforcement to pupils will have to be exposed to better classroom management methods.

The vast majority of teachers have received no training in pupil-behavior management beyond the classroom-management advice given in pre-service training and the homilies of principals and supervisory officers. Practical experience tends, evidently, to persuade young teachers of the need for such a means of discipline.

A survey by Regional Services revealed that except for a few examples of schools, there are no efforts by school boards or school systems to provide training in methods for dealing with difficult disciplinary situations or for improved classroom management methods.

Recommended Action

Having these considerations in mind, the following steps should be considered:

1. That the Minister write to the various concerned groups stating our concern and proposed action and asking for their reactions by some early date.

2. That Regulation 704/78, Section 21 be amended by adding to the duties of teachers a new clause along these lines:

   00) In disciplining a pupil, to refrain from the use of force except to protect himself or other pupils.

3. That following the report of the provincial review on discipline, a statement on the desirable school "ethos" be prepared and issued by the Ministry.

Policy Liaison and Legislation Branch
Ministry of Education
September, 1980

Revised January, 1981

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT IN THE SCHOOLS: NOTES ON THE MORAL COMPONENT

The General Issue

Corporal punishment is not only a legal and legislative issue, but also a moral issue.

As a legal and legislative issue (the level at which it is generally perceived), the discussion focuses primarily on:

--- the rights of the school, and the teacher, to administer physical punishment as retribution for misbehaviour, and

--- secondly, but only recently, the rights of children, and whether children have (civil) rights.

As a moral issue, it is a question of empathy for other human beings and fairness to them and of what constitutes these attitudes in education to children, in their role as students within the institution of the school.

There are a number of key words involved: legality, punishment, retribution, rights; and morality, fairness, worth, human beings. In society there is a kind of historically based congenital myopia in the inability to bridge the connection between these two groups of words and concepts in order to see the wider human, and humane, issues that are at stake.

The Literature: An Overview

There are various types of current literature on the issue of corporal punishment:

(1) Opinion:
- -- of teachers and other educational professionals,
- -- of trustees of boards of education,
- -- of parents of children in the schools, either individually (letters to newspapers, petitions and presentations to boards, letters to the Minister), or in groups (including opinion surveys and polls),
- -- of the general public who are not parents of children in the schools,
- -- of newspaper editors,
- -- of newspaper columnists.

(2) Research literature.

(3) Psychological and philosophical literature (research-based and/or theory-based.)

Opinion

The issue of corporal punishment has been the subject of a considerable amount of discussion in Ontario newspapers in recent months, particularly in the Toronto area. (A précis of the coverage for the period January 7th to May 6th is appended in Attachment A.) The controversy has been largely precipitated by the policy in favour of strapping in the elementary schools approved by the Peel County Board of Education. In general, the lines which have been drawn up appear to be:

(1) The Peel County trustees and the director of education favour strapping.

(2) Parent groups have come forward to oppose the use of corporal punishment.

(3) Editorials in the Toronto Star, the Globe and Mail, and the Mississauga News have opposed strapping in the schools.

(4) Two newspaper columnists have supported strapping: Harvey Currell (Toronto Sun), and Mackenzie Porter (Toronto Sun).

(5) OFHSA has come out in support of strapping.

(6) OSSTF is reported to support strapping, on the grounds that parents want it.

(7) The Children's Aid Society and the Mississauga Hospital are opposed.

(8) Some individual letters to newspapers have supported corporal punishment, but more have opposed it. (The score from April 21st to May 3rd, after the publication of the Toronto Star editorial, is 2 in favour and 7 opposed.)

Public opinion polls (such as Gallup) over the last few years, both in Canada and the United States, have shown that the general public lists "discipline in the schools" as a major concern. It cannot be assumed, however, that those who express this concern would approve corporal punishment; they appear to be calling for more explicit standards of conduct.

Research, Philosophical and Psychological Literature

There is a body of research literature, and of philosophical and psychological literature, that addresses the issue of corporal punishment. A large part of this literature is concerned with child-rearing, and thus speaks to the home environment and the relation of children with parents. This has direct implications for the relations of children with teachers (whose exercise of authority in discipline is that of a "kind, firm and judicious parent"). In general, it would be rare to

find a philosopher or psychologist of any school (social-learning, behaviourist, psychoanalytic, developmental) who advocates that adults use physical force against children as punishment. This is not because they support permissiveness; most agree that children need to know what adults expect of them, need to know why certain behaviours are not acceptable, and, at least for very young children, need to be restrained from situations which are dangerous to them.

There is an obvious ethical problem that faces the researcher: the classical laboratory model is unsuitable as a research mode in investigating this issue. That is, it is generally considered unethical to select an experimental group of children to whom to administer corporal punishment, to balance this with the conventional control group, and thus to assess the effect of physical punishment on children. Hence, many research studies focus on examining the backgrounds of children who are delinquent or prone to violence. In many instances, these children are found to have come from families in which corporal punishment is used frequently.

A few examples from this literature are cited here, from a summary in Derek Wright, The Psychology of Moral Behaviour (1971):

(1) Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency (1950)

> "The home backgrounds of 500 delinquents and 500 matched non-delinquents were studied by interviewing parents and other relatives. The discipline given to delinquents was predominantly lax and erratic on the part of the mother, and either overstrict or lax and erratic on the part of the father. Both parents used a great deal of physical punishment, and little reasoning and praise. The

parents of non-delinquents, on the other hand, were firm, kindly and consistent, reasoned much more, and much less frequently used physical punishment."

(2) McCord, and Zola, The Origin of Crime (1957)

"In this study, the home backgrounds of 253 boys aged ten, all of whom were expected to become delinquent, were investigated. A follow-up of these boys made it possible to compare the homes of those who subsequently became delinquent with the homes of those who did not. Again lax and erratic discipline which also involved extreme punitiveness and inconsistent demands was strongly associated with criminal behaviour."

(3) Bandura and Walters, Adolescent Aggression (1959)

"These authors intensively studied twenty-six boys with histories of antisocial aggression, most of whom were in the care of probation officers, with a matched control group of normal boys who were neither particularly aggressive nor particularly withdrawn. The mothers of aggressive boys were less effective at socializing their children and their sons were more attached to them than to their fathers. Both parents, but especially the father, tended to encourage aggression outside the home but to repress it with punishment at home. They too made greater use of physical punishment and of such verbal assaults as ridicule and nagging, and they reasoned less with their sons."

(4) Funkenstein, King and Drolette, Mastery of Stress (1957)

"(These researchers) found that the physiological pattern of response associated with an anger-out reaction was markedly different from that associated with anxiety or anger-in. It would seem that physical punishment is of all sanctions most likely to provoke the anger-out reaction, and this is incompatible with the anxiety which results in behavioural inhibition or self-control. We should therefore expect it to be a less effective sanction."

Wright cites these reports as typical of the work being done in research, but to him they are particularly noteworthy because of the thoroughness of their design. While they deal particularly with physical punishment by adults in the home, they have clear implications for the relations between children and adults in the context of the school.

In relation to these studies, Wright comments in particular on

> "...the association between delinquency and the high rate of physical punishment by parents. There is good evidence that physical punishment by the parents and aggression in boys (especially outside the home) tend to go together (Becker, 1964). Of course, it is an open question which is cause, which effect, though probably each is both a cause and an effect of the other; but we can safely conclude that physical punishment, particularly in the context of weak affection, does not reduce a child's general level of aggression. And it is not difficult to see why. Not only does physical assault provoke retaliatory aggression, but also the father is the child's chief model of how adults behave; and when he assaults his son, he is providing an excellent example of the very behaviour he is blaming the child for. The child is bound to become confused as a result. Considered in isolation from its context, there is no evidence that physical punishment is an effective way of bringing about permanent changes for the better in children."

A recent research report by Rutter, Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children (1979), has focused on the school as a social institution and the effect of its total atmoshpere, not only on student behaviour, but also on attendance, achievement, and delinquency outside the school. Student behaviour was significantly better in schools where teachers

-- started lessons promptly, without spending large amounts of time distributing papers and equipment,

-- were less casual about ending lessons early,
-- interrupted lessons less to discipline individual students,
-- gave students more responsibility for their own resources and equipment, and opportunities for leadership and responsibility within the class, as well as within the school (e.g., in assemblies),
-- acknowledged the good work of students in the classroom.

Behaviour was significantly lower in schools that used disciplinary measures involving detentions, writing of lines, admonishment by the headmaster. The findings further revealed that, in the case of the schools studied, corporal punishment actually had a negative relationship with behaviour; that is, there was a tendency for high levels of corporal punishment to be associated with worse behaviour.

It is also important to note that Rutter concluded that there is a general effect of the school atmosphere (or "ethos", as the researchers termed it). That is, schools that ranked high in relation to the others on behaviour scales, also generally ranked relatively high in attendance and academic achievement. In addition, they found that, where there might be only a moderate statistical relationship between a specific variable (e.g., student use of the school library) and a particular outcome (e.g., behaviour), the same variable might be highly related to the other outcomes (attendance, academic achievement, and lower delinquency outside the school). (See Attachment B.)

The lesson from this research is that it is necessary to look beyond one-dimensional relationships. Discussion of the issue of corporal punishment conventionally focusses on its

relationship to behaviour alone. Rutter's research looks at it within a broader spectrum: corporal punishment, for example, was found to be negatively related not only with behaviour, but also with academic achievement.

Alternative Approaches

(1) Authors such as Wright (noted above) place physical punishment into the context of its effect on the moral behaviour of children. He demonstrates, from research literature, its adverse effects over the longer term. Wright goes on to present an alternative model for the school, in terms of

-- student/staff relationships,
-- school punishment, student self-control, and the example of the teacher,
-- the connection between self-concept and self-control,
-- moral structures within the school,
-- moral actions of the teacher,
-- the kind of school that fosters moral development.

Excerpts from these statements are appended in Attachment C.

(2) Rutter's findings (noted above) have strong implications for the creation of a total school atmosphere that can produce higher levels of behaviour, attendance, and academic achievement, and lower levels of delinquency. (See Attachment B.)

(3) Various writings by Dreikurs and Dreikurs and Cassel outline alternative methods of discipline, based upon Adlerian approaches. These works include Children the Challenge (1964), A New Approach to Discipline: Logical Consequences (1968), Discipline Without Tears: What to do

with Children who Misbehave (1972). For example, "A New Approach to Discipline" includes 103 practical examples of ways to deal with situations involving misbehaving children, including school contexts.

Basing their approaches on the writings of Adler, Dreikurs and Cassel reject the extremes of both authoritarian and permissive approaches, maintaining that both repression and indulgence are ineffective. Their approaches are aimed at the child's accepting responsibility, and restraint is based upon logical consequences of actions.

Summary (Conclusions, Implications, Connections)

(1) Research has generated data that question the efficacy of physical punishment and has demonstrated the high probability of adverse effects over the longer term.

(2) Corporal punishment is not only a legal and legislative issue; it is also a moral issue, in its implications for interpersonal relations within the school, and for the part it plays within the total atmosphere of the school.

(3) Alternative models have been developed, particularly in the last decade. They do, however, demand a change in thinking on the part of adults--parents, administrators, teachers, trustees. Models which were accepted in the past are not sufficient to meet the demands of the changed society.

(4) The Government of Ontario has put in place legislation on child abuse, including requirements for school personnel to report suspected cases. It would be logical, in the interests of consistency of government policy, for the

Ministry of Education to establish policy against physical punishment in the schools. While the Ministry did issue a memorandum (1968-69:23) stating that corporal punishment is not appropriate in the schools, a statement dated over ten years ago tends to be viewed as a relic of the past. The current Ministry position should be stated.

(5) With the increasing attention being given to special education, it is generally, in most boards, considered inappropriate to administer physical punishment to pupils in a special education program--children who are considered exceptional because of physical impairment, learning disability or intellectual exceptionality. It does seem, however, that physical punishment is condoned in the case of children whose behaviour is so difficult as to warrant corporal punishment as a "last resort". If strapping is really used only in this way--as a "last resort"--as board policies usually state--it does seem that this would constitute a case of behavioural exceptionality--and, as such, like any other exceptionality, should not be punished by strapping. If it is not a case of last resort, then, by board policy, other ways have to be used to solve such behaviour. In either case, as board policies are now being written, it is doubtful that strapping can be defended.

This is not to say that all such children need a special <u>educational</u> program, as in cases of learning disability or intellectual exceptionality. Just that the school needs to take an approach that is more thoughtful than physical punishment. Since the Ministry is about to publish policy on special education, it seems to be an appropriate time to articulate policy on corporal punishment also. A humane approach should apply to <u>all</u> children.

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT

Attitudes Reflected in the Literature and General Comments

Discipline is best perceived as self-discipline--the development within an individual of the self-control necessary to function effectively as a contributing member of society. No one is born with self-control, it has to be learned. Historically, in most western cultures, discipline has been instilled in a child through punishment. One possible origin of this practice lies in adherence to religious beliefs which taught that human nature is basically evil and must be controlled. Discipline, therefore, became synonomous with obedience to controlling authority, and authority was represented by family elders, the church and the law. Under current conditions the achievement of obedience, through a sense of innate respect for these traditional authorities, has almost disappeared.

As the concept of unquestioning obedience to authority was eroded, self-discipline, because of its traditionally close relationship to this concept, also suffered a decline. Out of this re-arrangement of cultural values has come much that is good and much that is not so good. Many believe that the only way to fill this vacuum is to return to strict religious training or to use authoritarian measures. Of these, corporal punishment is the most obvious.

In the literature condemning the state of discipline in schools there is constant reference to factors believed to be responsible for such manifestations as unruly students, violence, vandalism and drug abuse. Some of these are:

-- the corrosion of human values
-- absolute individualism
-- contempt for the rights of others
-- a breakdown in family life
-- the worship of technology
-- a lack of religion, or "humanism".

Many supporters of corporal punishment appear to believe that these complex problems will be solved simply by returning to authoritarian teachers and stern parents.

A recent Ontario Gallup Poll asked the question: "What do you think are the biggest problems with which the schools in this community must deal?" The most frequent response was "lack of discipline." In an analysis of letters received by the Minister of Education during the Fall of 1978, a high percentage of the respondents felt that one of the most significant problems in schools was permissiveness.

In a report on the attitudes of students, parents, teachers, and administrators towards corporal punishment in schools (Shalka 1975), the findings showed that a majority of parents admitted to using corporal punishment at home. A majority of all groups expressed the belief that corporal punishment helps to improve student behaviour but not student achievement. Most favoured the notification of parents when a child is strapped but did not favour obtaining parental permission, with the exception of the student group. Finally, a majority in each of the four groups indicated approval of strapping.

In response, however, it should be pointed out that parents' and teachers' attitudes often reflect their experience, and studies have shown that approval of the use of corporal punishment is more likely to come from adults who received it when they were children. This could also account for the approval of some students who, if they are physically disciplined in the home, see no reason to doubt its efficacy at school. An Australian study of discipline in schools showed that the use of corporal punishment was supported by parents who had immigrated from the United Kingdom, where the cane had been a means of gaining classroom control and teaching the virtues of obedience; however, corporal punishment was opposed by parents from North European countries where it was forbidden.

Much of the attractiveness of the use of corporal punishment in schools lies in the ease with which discipline problems appear to be solved. Alternative forms of punishment require greater teacher involvement. Research shows that the use of corporal punishment in American schools has increased considerably over the last 20 years. Much controversy was generated as a result of the Supreme Court ruling in the Wright vs Ingraham case which held that corporal punishment does not violate students' rights under the Eighth Amendment (which guarantees freedom from cruel and unusual punishment). As a result of this case, it has been made clear that public school students in the United States have no constitutional rights to protect them from corporal punishment. This bears out the observation that the "greatest influences to the changes in the manner in which students are disciplined do not come from the efforts of enlightened educators but rather the decrees of the judicial system" (Smith 1975).

Teachers in the United States show no sign of relinquishing their right to use corporal punishment. In 1961 the

National Education Association favoured it by 3 to 1. In the five years up to 1971, the number of schools using it tripled. The use of corporal punishment is even negotiated in teachers contracts (Raichle 1977-78). A questionnaire sent to all 50 State Commissioners of Education showed that, while only 40 states specifically authorize corporal punishment, 44 admit they administer it. One spokesman for a state that did not sanction it is quoted as saying, "Although corporal punishment is not a creative method of discipline, it certainly establishes immediate contact with pupils" (Boonen 1977). It seems that corporal punishment is an accepted and practised control mechanism in many schools.

In Canada as well, supporters of the use of corporal punishment see the strap as a necessary part of the teaching process. In 1972 the London Board of Education voted against the use of corporal punishment, but in 1975 it was re-instated with the support of 97 per cent of the teachers and 70 per cent of the parents. In Lethbridge, where the school board banned the strap in 1973, the opinions of teachers were quoted:

> "(The teacher) is expected to maintain discipline but his authority to do so has been removed."
>
> "The strap acted as a successful deterrent. If a student got the strap, it toned up the whole school."
>
> "Teachers told us the motion (to abolish the strap) didn't make sense because they knew they could hurt a child more by verbal than physical abuse."

The president of the Home and School Association commented:

> "Corporal punishment is necessary because children become permissive at a very early age. If they learn discipline in elementary school, there is no problem in high school. If not, you have a defiant bunch of little brats. I love children." (Kolmes 1975)

Some Canadian teachers see the use of corporal punishment as protection:

> "We can no more abolish the strap without providing alternatives to protect the innocent, than we can talk about abolishing capital punishment without consideration for the protection of all society." (Sharkey 1975)

An Ontario principal is quoted (Carter, 1975) as firmly believing that he supports the most widely held position, and in support of his belief cites John Millar, a former Deputy Minister of Education (1897):

> "Most modern educators hold that corporal punishment in schools cannot be entirely dispensed with until we have ideal disciplinarians in an ideal state of society. This kind of punishment...is the proper way of dealing with wilful defiance, with obstinate carelessness."

Finally, this principal expresses a view that perhaps summarizes the thinking of most supporters of corporal punishment.

> "Some people might argue that...abuses are reason enough to ban completely corporal punishment. I feel this reasoning is comparable to saying that since some people are injured in cars no one should drive."

.....

Policy

There are many arguments favouring the use of corporal punishment, chief among which is the principle of in loco parentis, the teacher taking the parent's place. But what if the teacher believes in striking the child, but the parent does not? A report on corporal punishment in Canadian schoools, completed by the Canadian Education Association in 1976, shows that the basis for the Canadian position rests on the Criminal Code which, in effect, describes in loco parentis.

> It is lawful for every parent or person in place of a parent, schoolmaster or master, to use force by way of correction towards any child, pupil or apprentice under his care, providing such force is reasonable under the circumstances.

Only the province of British Columbia has banned the use of the strap. The remaining provinces leave the matter to the local boards. The positions taken by provinces throughout Canada are as follows:

British Columbia - corporal punishment was banned by regulation in 1973. Section 14. - (1) of The School Act regulations states "The discipline in every school shall be similar to that of a kind, firm and judicious parent but shall not include corporal punishment."

Alberta - takes no stand - matter for local jurisdication

Saskatchewan - no official position

Manitoba - the teacher shall maintain proper order

Quebec - approves corporal punishment, but the principal shall decide and keep a record

New Brunswick - the teacher to practice such discipline... with advice and direction from the principal

Nova Scotia - corporal punishment should be administered ... as a last resort

Prince Edward Island - it is the duty of every teacher to practice such discipline as would be...by parent, etc.

Newfoundland - teachers are permitted to use corporal punishment

In Ontario corporal punishment is not specifically mentioned in school law or regulations.

Section 229 (1) (e) of The Education Act, 1974:

> It is the duty of a teacher...to maintain, under the direction of the principal, proper order and discipline in his classroom and while on duty in the school and on the playground.

Section 24 (1) (c) of Ontario Regulation 704/78:

> A pupil shall accept such discipline as would be exercised by a kind, firm, and judicious parent.

Section 24 (1) (c) of Ontario Regulation 704/78 and its predecessors was generally interpreted to condone the use of corporal punishment until 1968, when the Ontario Department of Education issued a memorandum to the educational community which clarified its position and stated that "...corporal punishment in any form is not appropriate in the schools of Ontario and it is recommended that principals and teachers refrain from its use."

In February of 1979, the Regional Directors of Education throughout Ontario were asked to provide the Ministry with the following information:

(a) The policies of the local school boards regarding corporal punishment;

(b) A list of any school boards which are presently studying, or have recently studied, corporal punishment;

(c) A short list of key personnel who would be prepared to discuss the issues.

Of the 125 boards surveyed, 90 responded. Of these 90 boards only three have formally abolished corporal punishment. Forty-seven of the respondents have policies on its use, and six are at present involved in some type of study related to discipline.

From the information supplied by the boards it is clear that the use of corporal punishment is retained because the teachers want it and the parents expect it. Many view the subject as a "non-issue". One educator commented that the question of whether to use corporal punishment has no significance, since it affects such a relatively small percentage of the student population!

Most people view corporal punishment as a necessary last resort when all alternatives have failed. Repeatedly, the case for retaining the use of the strap is endorsed because it is preferred to the use of sarcasm, ridicule, or other psychological forms of punishment. Hardly ever do teachers or parents see alternatives to corporal punishment as anything but other forms of punishment. It appears that there is little awareness of alternatives that do not use verbal or physical abuse to maintain discipline.

Alternatives

Opposition to the use of corporal punishment is often expressed in moral terms:

> Punishment has a history of ineffectiveness and futility covering several thousand years. Punishment is considered detrimental to the development of democratic views and truly democratic discipline. The dominating tendencies and aggression manifested by persons applying punishment indicate that these persons, in some degree, are neurotic. Children rapidly learn the methods of authority, dominance and aggression demonstrated by the teacher. (Feshback 1977)

> Since methods which are demonstrably more effective are available, reliance on punishment and strong-arm methods seem truly wasteful. All forms of correction with punishment have one thing in common: A person learns from them what not to do, but not what to do. (Chamberlin 1971)

Under the heading of Moral Development, the Hall-Dennis Report (1968) includes the following:

> Punishment is demoralizing because it negates responsibility. It fosters cynicism and a belief that the thing to do is simply to avoid being caught by those who have the authority to punish. It also causes those who are caught to think that they have paid their debt to society by virtue of the punishment they have received, an attitude indicative of amorality and irresponsibility.

And in a report prepared by the U.S. National Education Task Force on Corporal Punishment in 1972:

> Studies show that the degree of physical punishment used by parents is positively correlated with various forms of psychopathy and

> negatively related to conscience development. The child learns aggressiveness towards those of lesser power. Many educators maintain that judicious use is beneficial. Unfortunately, many educators are apparently unaware that alternatives exist.

The Task Force lists some of the alternatives to corporal punishment.

Short Range Solutions

> The first step that must be taken is the elimination of the use of punishment as a means of maintaining discipline. Then, the ideas below can be used as temporary measures to maintain discipline while longer-range programs are being put into effect.

1. Quiet places (corners, small rooms, retreats).
2. Student-teacher agreement on immediate alternatives.
3. Teams of adults--teachers, administrators, aides, volunteers (parents and others)--to take students aside when they are disruptive and listen to them, talk to them, and counsel them until periods of instability subside.
4. Similar services for educators whose stamina is exhausted.
5. Social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists to work on a one-to-one basis with disruptive students or distraught teachers.
6. Alternate experiences for students who are bored or unreceptive to particular educational experiences:
   a. independent projects
   b. listening and viewing experiences with technological learning devices
   c. library research
   d. work study experience

7. In-service programs to help teachers and other school staff members learn a variety of techniques for building better relations with students and among students:

   a. Class meetings (Glasser technique)
   b. Role playing
   c. Case study--what would you do?
   d. Student-teacher human relations retreats and outings
   e. Teacher (or other staff)--student-parent conferences

8. Class discussion of natural consequences of good and bad behaviour (not threats or promises); of what behaviour is right; of what behaviour achieves desired results; of causes of a "bad day" for the class.

9. Privileges to bestow or withdraw.

10. Approval or disapproval.

11. Other staff members to work with a class whose teacher needs a break.

Intermediate Range Solutions

1. A discipline policy and procedures developed jointly by staff and students.

2. Staff-student committee to implement discipline policy.

3. Parent education programs in interpersonal relations.

4. Staff in-service program on interpersonal relations, on understanding emotions and on dealing with children when they are disruptive.

5. Student human relations councils and grievance procedures.

6. Training for students and teachers in crisis intervention.

7. Training for students in student advocacy.

8. Training for teachers in dealing with fear of physical violence.

9. Regular opportunities for principals to experience classroom situations.

Long Range Solutions in Schools

1. Full involvement of students in the decision making process in the school.

2. Curriculum content revision and expansion by students and staff to motivate student interest.

3. Teacher in-service programs on new teaching strategies to maintain student interest.

4. Alternate programs for students.

5. Work-study programs.

6. Drop-out drop-back-in programs.

7. Alternative schools within the public school system.

8. Early entrance to college.

9. Alternatives to formal program during last two years of high school.

10. Few enough students per staff member that staff can really get to know students.

11. Adequate professional specialists--psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers.

12. Aides and technicians to carry out paraprofessional, clerical, and technical duties so that professional staff members are free to work directly with students more of the time.

13. A wide variety of learning materials and technological devices.

14. Full implementation of the Code of Student Rights.

15. Full implementation of NEA Resolution 71-12; "Student Involvement"--

> The National Education Association believes that genuine student involvement requires responsible student action which is possible if students are guaranteed certain basic rights, among which are the following: the right to free inquiry and expression; the right to due process; the right to freedom of association; the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and petition; the right to participate in the governance of the school, college and university; the right to freedom from discrimination; and the right to equal educational opportunity.

Long-Range Solutions With Other Agencies

1. Staff help from local and regional mental health and human relations agencies.
2. More consultant staff to work with individual problem students.
3. Long range intensive in-service programs to prepare all staff to become counsellors.
4. Mass media presentations directed to both the public and the profession on the place of children in contemporary American Society.
5. Some educational experiences relocated in business, industry, and social agencies.
6. Increased human relations training in pre-service teacher education and specific preparation in constructive disciplinary procedures.

Besides Dr. William Glasser, mentioned previously, whose method of classroom discipline is based on a ten-step program of techniques for the teacher to follow, other authorities on discipline without the use of corporal punishment are:

Harvey F. Clarizio, author of Toward Positive Classroom Discipline:

> Teachers can be taught five techniques consistent with the teacher's role whereby he or she must reflect cultural expectations to the pupils and must set standards for their academic and social behaviour. These techniques expand the teacher's control skills and avoid over-reliance on any given disciplinary strategy.

Dreikurs and Cassel in Discipline Without Tears, and Dreikurs and Grey in A New Approach to Discipline:

> The old tradition of raising and teaching children, which came from an autocratic society, is no longer effective in a democratic setting. We have to learn new forms of dealing with each other because our relationships have changed. The adult/child relationships in the past were ones of dominance and submission. Today, equality is the only basis on which we'll ever be able to solve discipline problems effectively.

Dreikurs and Cassel follow the lead of Alfred Adler in stating that the basic premises on the nature of human behaviours are:

1. Man is a social being and his main desire is to belong. This is true for adults and children alike.

2. All behaviour has purpose. One cannot understand the behaviour of another person unless one knows to which goal it is directed, and it is always directed towards finding one's place. If a person or child misbehaves, then it indicates that he has wrong ideas about how to be significant.

3. Man is a decision-making organism. He decides what he really wants to do, often without being aware of it. He is not a victim of forces converging on him such as heredity, environment or other outside influences, including Freud's psychosexual development. (It is the realization that man can determine what he wants to do that is the basis for our corrective and therapeutic optimism.)

4. Man is a whole being who cannot be understood by some partial characteristics. The whole is greater than the sum total of the parts. (This is a very important theoretical pre-requisite because it permits us to perceive the whole individual without going into a lengthy exploration. We can perceive a 'pattern' of behaviour.)

5. Man does not see reality as it is, but only as he perceives it, and his perception may be mistaken or biased.

.....

In summation then, it appears that the use of corporal punishment is rarely effective in the long run, that it is likely to reinforce poor behaviour, and that it can result in counter-agression and revenge. Most of those who support the idea of inflicting pain upon a child as a means of securing satisfactory behaviour do not look any further than the immediate response of the child who has been beaten. Instant submissiveness, which frequently results from the use of violence by the strong upon the weak, is accepted as a successful interaction, and, therefore, the strap is seen as a regrettable but necessary means to an end.

The initiatives and incentives that drove previous generations to labour for success in life no longer in themselves motivate the youth of today. The threat of hardship for the non-achievers is an empty threat when, by observation, it can be seen that non-achievers today are largely assured of at least minimal security and protection from hardship. Motivation, then, cannot be induced or encouraged any longer purely at the reward/punishment level.

It is often forgotten that many of the conditions that produced so-called respect for authority in earlier generations no longer exist. It was an accepted premise that the responsibility of raising children rested entirely on parents and that the behaviour of children was a reflection on the ability of those parents. In most cases, one parent worked, and one parent stayed at home to supervise the children. Members of the older generation, looking back on a childhood that was almost completely planned and supervised by adults, have difficulty understanding the behavior of today's children. They seldom remember that they had very few choices 30 or 40 years ago, and even less knowledge of what was happening in

the world outside the narrow, restricted environment of their home and immediate community. The authority of parents or teachers was not questioned because children were not permitted to believe that such an alternative was open to them. As is usually the case the older generation recalls its past as a respectful and virtuous era. The "correct" behavior of children was, however, based much more on ignorance and intimidation than on any innate virtue in social attitudes and practices.

To-day, as a result of changing social patterns and the influence of the media, children are given insight into alternate forms of behaviour never available to children before.

At the same time it cannot be argued that children are not influenced by the examples set by those they come in contact with and particularly by those they admire and look up to, or that this influence will not be reflected in their behaviour. The precept and example of parents, teachers and other people in regular contact directly or vicariously with children remain a potent force by which their conduct is moulded.

Children become aware at a very early age that they can choose to behave in a certain way to obtain specific ends, without at the same time having any understanding of the long-range effects of their choices. Their reasoning is undeveloped, it is self-serving, impulsive, and designed to manipulate only present conditions. In other words, they behave like children. If adults respond in a like manner, seeking only to resolve the problems of the moment by correcting, for example, deviant behaviour by the use of corporal punishment for the sake of the moment of peace that will

follow, then they too are reacting at the same level at which the child operates. They are functioning impulsively, acting in a self-serving manner to manipulate a situation, and resolving a problem on a purely temporary basis without considering the long-range effects of their actions.

There is nothing in the literature to suggest that corporal punishment serves any purpose but that of expediency or that it is in any way consistent with the goals of education that have been adopted for Ontario schools.

Alternatives to the strap do exist. It is clearly time to stop hitting and start talking.

REFERENCES

References Cited:

Bandura, A. & Walters, R. H. Adolescent Aggression.
New York: Ronald Press (1959)

Dreikurs, R. & Cassel, P. Discipline Without Tears.
New York: Hawthorn Books (1972)

Dreikurs, R. & Grey, L. A New Approach to Discipline.
New York: Hawthorn Books (1968)

Dreikurs, R. & Soltz, V. Children: The Challenge.
New York: Hawthorn Books (1964)

Funkenstein, D., King, S. & Drolette, C. Mastery of Stress.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press (1957)

Glueck, S. & Glueck, E. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency.
New York: Commonwealth Fund (1950)

McCord, W., McCord, J. & Zola, I. The Origins of Crime.
New York: Columbia University Press (1957)

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, P.
Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children.
Cambridge: Harvard University Press (1979)

Wright, D. The Psychology of Moral Behaviour.
Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd. (1971)

Other References:

Cryan, J. R. & Smith, J. C. The Hick'ry Stick: It's Time to Change the Tune. Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 6 (1981)

Durkheim, E. Moral Education (Translated from L'éducation morale. Paris, 1925)
New York: Free Press (1961)

Glasser, W. The Identity Society
New York: Harper & Row (1972)

Sprinthall, R. C. & Sprinthall, N. A. Educational Psychology: A Developmental Approach.
Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley (1977)

Walters, G. C. & Grusec, J. E. Punishment.
San Francisco: W. H. Freeman (1977)

Williams, N. & S. The Moral Development of Children.
London: Macmillan (1970)

REFERENCES

References Cited:

A Report on Corporal Punishment in Canadian Schools. Canadian Education Association Bulletin (1977)

Boonin, T. From a School Board Member: The Case Against Corporal Punishment in the Public Schools. American School Board Journal (1977)

Carter, M. A Last Resort. Education Canada (1976)

Clarizio, H. F. Toward Positive Classroom Discipline. New York: John Wiley & Sons (1971)

Corporal Punishment: General Report of the Alberta Discipline Study. Alberta Department of Education (1975-76)

Dreikurs, R. & Cassel, P. Discipline Without Tears. New York: Hawthorn Books (1972)

Dreikurs, R. & Grey L. A New Approach to Discipline. New York: Hawthorn Books (1968)

Feshbach, S. & Feshbach, N. D. Public Policy for Children. Clearing House - abstract (1976)

Kolmes, J. Spoil the Rod and Spare the Child. ATA Magazine (1975)

London Board of Education, Guidelines for Strapping. Educational Courier (1976)

Report of the Task Force on Corporal Punishment. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association (1972)

Raichle, D. R. School Discipline and Corporal Punishment: An American Retrospect. Interchange, 8, 1-2 (1977-78)

Sharkey, N. The Strap: To Be Or Not To Be Is Not the Question. Educational Courier (1975)

Smith, R. C. Discipline, Corporal Punishment and Suspension. Clearing House - abstract (1975)

Other References:

Ban, J. R. & Ciminillo, L. M. Violence and Vandalism in Public Education. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Printers, Inc. (1977)

Beckingham, M. Are There Effective Alternatives to Corporal Punishment? Educational Courier (1976)

Bongiovanni, A. F. & Hyman I. Leviton Is Wrong on the Use of Corporal Punishment.
Psychology in Schools, 15 (1978)

Burch, N. What You Already Know About Discipline.
NJEA Review (1975)

Clarizio, H. Some Myths Regarding the Use of Corporal Punishment in the Schools.
Clearing House - abstract (1975)

Cultice, W. W. Positive Discipline for a More Productive Educational Climate.
Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall (1969)

Discipline in Secondary Schools in Western Australia.
Western Australia Department of Education (1971)

Dreikurs, R. & Soltz, V. Children: The Challenge.
New York: Hawthorn Books (1975)

Ebel, R. L. The Case for Corporal Punishment.
Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C. (1975)

Englander, M. E. The Court's Corporal Punishment Mandate to Parents, Local Authorities, and the Profession.
Phi Delta Kappan (1978)

Faber, C. F. Corporal Punishment: Not Cruel and Unusual?
Clearing House 51 (1978)

Fontana, V. J. Child Abuse in the Name of Discipline.
Clearing House - abstract (1976)

Friedman, D. B. Corporal Punishment in the Schools: Discipline or Abuse.
Clearing House - abstract (1976)

Garza, G. Discipline, Corporal Punishment and Suspension.
Clearing House - abstract (1976)

Hapkiexicz, W. G. Research on Corporal Punishment Effectiveness: Contributions and Limitations.
Clearing House - abstract (1975)

Hart, J. E. & Lordon, J. F. School Discipline: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow.
Clearing House - abstract (1978)

Hawkins, V. J. The Negativism of Corporal Punishment.
Clearing House (1976)

Howard, E. R. School Discipline Desk Book.
New York: Parker Publishing Inc. (1978)

Jones, J. W. Discipline Crisis in Schools (Education U.S.A. Special Report)
Arlington, Va.: National School Public Relations Association (1973)

Levine, M. A. Are Teachers Becoming More Humane?
Phi Delta Kappan (1978)

Leviton, H. S. Response to Bongiovanni and Hyman.
Psychology in Schools, 15 (1978)

Mahood, G. Comments on Corporal Punishment.
Brief to North York Board of Education (1971)

Mallios, H. C. Corporal Punishment and the Law.
The High School Journal (1976)

Maurer, A. Focussed Issue Advocacy: Corporal Punishment.
Clearing House - abstract (1977)

Mornell, E. S. Corporal Punishment of Children in the Schools: Statement.
Clearing House - abstract (1976)

Myers, C. Punishment: Problems in Definition.
Clearing House - abstract (1975)

Patterson, J. L. And the Beat Goes On.
NASSP Bulletin (1975)

Piele, P. K. Neither Corporal Punishment Cruel Nor Due Process: The U.S. Supreme Court's Decision in "Ingraham v. Wright".
Clearing House - abstract (1977)

Reinholz, L. K. A Practical Defense of Corporal Punishment.
Clearing House - abstract (1976)

Rentschler, D. R. Applying the Hand of Wisdom to the Seat of Learning: The 1974 Legislative Response in North Carolina.
The High School Journal (1975)

Simpson, R. J. Fifteen Things You Need to Know About Corporal Punishment in Schools.
American School Board Journal (1977)

Stennett, R. G. & Bramwell, J. R. Elementary School Classroom Management Survey.
Board of Education, City of London (1975)

Wattenberg, W. W. To Punish Or Not To Punish.
Clearing House - abstract (1975)

Welsh, R. S. The Supreme Court Spanking Rule: An Issue in Debate.
Clearing House - abstract (1976)

Wise, J. H. Proceedings: Conference on Corporal Punishment in the Schools: A National Debate.
Clearing House - abstract (1977)

Zanella, R. E. Can Principals Still Discipline?
NASSP Bulletin (1976)

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS REGARDING OPINIONS ON CORPORAL PUNISHMENT AND DISCIPLINE -- EXCERPTED FROM THE PROVINCIAL REVIEW OF SCHOOL DISCIPLINARY POLICY AND PRACTICES

This is a preliminary summary of opinions expressed by parents, teachers and pupils in answer to questionnaires that formed part of the Provincial Review of School Disciplinary Policy and Practices (to be published separately). Questionnaires were returned by 2043 parents, 925 teachers, and 2267 pupils.

Parents

Parents indicated strongly that they prefer a positive approach to school discipline. Suggestions commonly offered include

--- emphasis on rewarding good behaviour,

--- emphasis on recognizing positive actions by pupils,

--- communication with parents when problems arise,

--- discussion between teachers and pupils, along with clarification of expectations for behaviour and work.

These suggestions support the need for the school to establish clearly an ethos that is task-oriented and that also recognizes and rewards positive behaviour.

Nevertheless, of 2043 parents returning this questionnaire, 1014 supported the view that the strap should be used as a last resort to deal with persistent misbehaviour, and 1066 agreed with the statement that it should be employed when a pupil shows continual and deliberate defiance of the authority of the school.

When asked whether they would approve the use of the strap on their own child if the principal thought it appropriate, 1199 parents answered "yes", and 649 replied "no". When asked whether they wish to be informed if their child is strapped, 1314 parents said that they should be informed before the punishment, 327 after the punishment, and 60 said that they did not wish to be informed.

Among parents, then, opinion appears to be divided, with a significant minority (32 per cent) opposing corporal punishment, but about one-half of parents supporting its use as a last resort in dealing with persistent and deliberate misbehaviour. Only approximately three per cent of parents felt that use of the strap was appropriate as a means of dealing with failure to do homework or of improving academic performance.

The results of this part of the survey indicate that, if action is taken to restrict the use of corporal punishment in the schools, there should be some public discussion aimed at establishing a positive approach. It appears that there is at present a considerable amount of support for such a policy.

Teachers

When asked to indicate their preferred methods of classroom management for dealing with misbehaviour of their students, teachers in general indicated very high or high preferences for

--- discussion with pupils,

--- discussion with parents,

--- recognition of good behaviour,

--- some restriction of privileges.

Low preferences were expressed for

--- removal from class,

--- suspension from school,

--- sending misbehaving pupils to the principal's office, or to special helpers (e.g., counsellors, psychologists).

The lowest preferences were accorded to

--- strapping and physical punishment.

Of the 925 teachers who returned the questionnaire, slightly more than one-half (477) agreed with the view that the strap should be used as a last resort to deal with continual, deliberate defiance of school authority. Slightly more than one-third (347) felt that the strap should be used to deter a child whose actions could harm himself or other children. About 20 per cent (190) of the teachers sampled believed that strapping should not be used at all.

Pupils

Like teachers, pupils, when asked for their preferences in effective methods for dealing with classroom misbehaviour, showed high preferences for

--- discussion with the pupil about the problem,

--- discussion with parents,

--- restriction of privileges.

While they showed some support for

--- removal from class,

--- suspension from school,

--- sending misbehaving pupils to the principal's office, or to special helpers (e.g., counsellors, school psychologists),

--- detentions,

--- assignment of extra schoolwork,

like teachers, pupils also showed lowest support for

--- strapping and physical punishment.

Of 2267 pupils who returned the questionnaire, 1177 were of the opinion that use of the strap did not make pupils behave better, while 379 felt that it did, and 543 said that they did not know. About one-half (1168) of those responding felt that if the use of the strap were taken out of the schools there would be no effect on the number of discipline problems, while 644 felt that there would be more problems, and 233 felt that there would be fewer.

In addition, about one-half (1146) of the pupils said that if they were the teacher they would not use the strap, while 809 said that it would depend on the situation, and 167 said that they would use the strap. Some pupils who offered additional comments about strapping expressed opinions about

--- its ineffectiveness in solving the problem,

--- its tendency to aggravate students further, and to foster anger and retaliation through vandalism,

--- its inhumanity.

Some pupils felt that the strap should be used only as a last resort, but that other methods of dealing with misbehaviour are generally to be preferred.

Paper/Date/Coverage Source/Ed./Wire/Letter	Place of Event	Headline	Topic and Viewpoint JANUARY 1980
0044 News Mississauga 80 01 07 Inches 008 Words 0400 44	Editorial	Peel Board Level: Elementary	Headline Re-open Strapping Question	Topic Boards: Strapping Viewpoint Strapping policy approved by 13-4 vote. No provisions for public debate. Physical punishment must remain the preserve of the parent.
0255 News Mississauga 80 01 16 Inches 015 Words 0750 254	Kotef, Will	Peel Board Level: Unspecified	Headline Use Of Strap Opposed: School Board Asked To Review Policy.	Topic Parents: Strapping Viewpoint Parents oppose board's policy. Do not think there was enough parent consultation.
0583 News Mississauga 80 01 30 Inches 010 Words 0500 702	Report Koteff, Will	Peel Board Level: Public School	Headline Parents Continue Fight Against Use Of The Strap	Topic Parents: Strapping Viewpoint Parents group continues to criticize Board's policy on strapping and general attitude to discipline.

0013
Star
Toronto
80 01 07
Inches 007
Words 0350
13

Report
Calleja, Frank

Peel Board
Level: Elementary

Headline
Parent To Challenge Use Of Strap In Peel

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
Parents want to study board's policy on strapping. Board chairman says strap only used in extreme circumstances to accomplish positive response.

0073
Star
Toronto
80 01 09
Inches 015
Words 0750
73

Smith, Jackie

Peel Board
Level: Unspecified

Headline
Repudiate Use Of Strap, Peel Trustees Asked

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
Parents reject Board's policy on strapping. Controversy over whether or not parent consulted before or after punishment.

0140
Star
Toronto
80 01 17
Inches 008
Words 0400
198

Report
Calleja, Frank

Peel Board
Level: Unspecified

Headline
Peel Mom Claims Victory In Battle Against Strap

Topic Parents Strapping

Viewpoint
Director decides to make boards discipline policy available for review after parents brief on abolishing use of strap.

Paper/Date/Coverage Source/Ed./Wire/Letter	Place of Event	Headline	Topic and Viewpoint JANUARY 1980
0295 Star Toronto 80 01 23 Inches 009 Words 0450 294	Report Smith, Jackie .	Peel Board Level: Elementary	Headline Peel Reaffirms Strap Policy.	Topic Trustees: Strapping Viewpoint Trustees vote 9-7 against notion to advise parents before a child is strapped.
0072 Sun Toronto 80 01 09 Inches 012 Words 0600 72	Report	Peel Board Level: Unspecified	Headline Strapping Is Blitzed	Topic Parents: Strapping Viewpoint Boards policy on strapping criticized by parents. Results of questionnaire shows a great majority of parents support it claims Russ Jackson.
0192 Times Brampton 80 01 09 Inches 010 Words 0500 145	Report	Peel Board Level: Elementary	Headline Parents Protest Return Of Strap	Topic Parents: Strapping Viewpoint Peel parents protest Board's policy to use strap.

0296
Times
Brampton
80 01 11
Inches 003
Words 0150
295

Report

Peel Board
Level: Elementary

Headline
School Official Defends Strap.

Topic Administrators: Strapping

Viewpoint
Director Fraser says strap is used in dozens of schools in Ontario. Has no complaint from parents or Children's Aid Society.

0498
Times
Brampton
80 01 25
Inches 011
Words 0550
497

Report
Hogan, Al

Peel Board
Level: Public School

Headline
Strap Not Legal CAS Board Says

Topic Boards: Strapping

Viewpoint
Children's Aid to oppose Board on strapping issue. Conflict in legal aspects of corporal punishment.

Paper/Date/Coverage Source/Ed./Wire/Letter	Place of Event	Headline FEBRUARY 80	Topic and Viewpoint
0563 Globe & Mail Toronto 80 02 07 Inches 015 Words 0750	Report Murphy, Mike	Hamilton Board Level: Public School	Headline No Mention Of Strap In Rules Code	Topic Boards: Strapping Viewpoint Board uses caution drafting policy on discipline. Will use Peel and Halton policy as a basis to work from.
0962B News Mississauga 80 02 27 Inches 002 Words 0100	Report Koteff, Will	Peel Board Level: Elementary	Headline Strapping	Topic Schools: Strapping Viewpoint Survey shows the strap was used 363 times last year.
0883 Star Toronto 80 02 27 Inches 007 Words 0350	Report Smith, Jackie	Peel Board Level: Elementary	Headline Strap Use In Peel 363 Times In '79	Topic Boards: Strapping Viewpoint Parents hope Ministry will eventually ban strapping but board chairman says there will be no change to policy.
0517 Sun Toronto 80 02 04 Inches 009 Words 0450	Editorial Currell, Harvey	Metro Toronto Level: Elementary	Headline Take Strap To Violent Students	Topic Administrators: Strapping Viewpoint A Principal wants to involve community and parents in cases of violence in students but Currell wants to strap them.

Paper/Date/Coverage Source/Ed./Wire/Letter		Place of Event	Headline	Topic and Viewpoint
1406 Citizen Ottawa 80 03 12 Inches 010 Words 0500 346	Report	Carleton RCSS Level: Separate	Headline CSSB Trustees To Vote On Abolition Of Strap	Topic Schools: Strapping Viewpoint Management committee approves recommendation to abolish use of strap in its schools and look for other ways to discipline children.
1580 Citizen Ottawa 80 03 19 Inches 004 Words 0200 509	Report Taber, Jane	Carleton RCSS Level: Separate	Headline Strap Scrapped	Topic Boards: Strapping Viewpoint CSSB bans corporal punishment in wake of probe into PA incident.
0563 Globe & Mail Toronto 80 02 07 Inches 015 Words 0750 6	Report Murphy, Mike	Hamilton Board Level: Public School	Headline No Mention Of Strap In Rules Code	Topic Boards: Strapping Viewpoint Board uses caution drafting policy on discipline. Will use Peel and Halton policy as a basis to work from.
1620 Star Windsor 80 03 14 Inches 006 Words 0300 538	Report	Carleton RCSS Level: Separate	Headline School Board Bans Use Of Strap	Topic Boards: Strapping Viewpoint Trustees voted 8-4 in favour of banning strapping.

1624
Whig Standard
Kingston
80 03 19
Inches 004
Words 0200
534

Report

Carleton RCSS
Level: Separate

Headline
School Board Bans Corporal Punishment

Topic Boards: Strapping

Viewpoint
Trustees voted 8-4 in favour of banning strapping.

Paper/Date/Coverage Source/Ed./Wire/Letter	Place of Event	Headline	Topic and Viewpoint APRIL 1980
1976 Beacon Stratford 80 04 11 Inches 005 Words 0400 296	Wire Service	Ontario Level: Public School	Headline Parents Favor Strap Use--Survey	Topic Parents: Strapping Viewpoint OSSTF claims parents want strap to be retained.
1871 Globe & Mail Toronto 80 04 21 Inches 004 Words 0200 206	Report	Ontario Level: Public School	Headline Ban On Strap Vetoed By Parents' Group	Topic Parents: Strapping Viewpoint Abolition of the strap was strongly defeated at OFHSA convention.
1977 Globe & Mail Toronto 80 04 24 Inches 010 Words 0500 297	Editorial	Ontario Level: Public School	Headline Intimidation Won't Help	Topic Parents: Strapping Viewpoint OFHSA resolution supporting the use of the strap closes the doors of Ontario schools to a little more civilized humanity.
2051 Spectator Hamilton 80 04 22 Inches 008 Words 0400 391	Editorial	Ontario Level: Public School	Headline Parents Realistic About The Strap	Topic Parents: Strapping Viewpoint It has been found that discipline without realistic punishment to back up decent behaviour is not possible.

1751
Star
Toronto
80 04 11
Inches 007
Words 0350
91

Report
Vienneau, David

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Strap Needed As Deterrent Parents Say

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
Ontario Federation of Home and School Associations survey of parents found 75% in favour of retaining the strap in schools.

1759
Star
Toronto
80 04 13
Inches 008
Words 0400
99

Editorial

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Strap Has No Place In Schools

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
Home and School parents' survey favouring the strap should be challenged. Parents should oppose strangers beating their children.

1884
Star
Toronto
80 04 20
Inches 010
Words 0500
219

Report

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Parents Defeat Move To Ban Strap In School

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
The Ministry will never abolish strap as long as the OFHSA supports it says trustee at annual conference.

1881
Star
Toronto
80 04 21
Inches 010
Words 0500
216

Report

Peel Board
Level: Executive

Headline
Strapping Statistics Not Public

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
Ministry's J. Storey tells Mississauga parent she is not entitled to see details of number of strappings.

1882
Star
Toronto
80 04 21
Inches 005
Words 0250
217

Letter
Petrunak, S.

Toronto
Level: Public School

Headline
Lack Of Control In Schools

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
It is time that society took off its blinkers and faced the fact that obedience and order cannot be maintained by empathy and psychological drivel.

1900
Star
Toronto
80 04 22
Inches 004
Words 0200
235

Letter
Griffith, H.

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Keep Strap In School, Parent Suggests

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
Strap merely a means to enforce rules for good manners and civil behaviour.

1901
Star
Toronto
80 04 22
Inches 002
Words 0100
236

Letter
Taylor, P.

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Strap Is Deterrent

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
Violence is a deterrent.

1902
Star
Toronto
80 04 22
Inches 002
Words 0100
237

Letter
Morris, David

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Hands Off My Children

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
We will do our own disciplining if required.

2066
Star
Toronto
80 04 28
Inches 003
Words 0150
378

Letter
Vald'or, A. M.

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Better Answer Than The Strap Woman Argues

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
Skilled animal trainers do not use violence. Why do we resort to this method with children.

2065
Star
Toronto
80 04 30
Inches 010
Words 0600
410

Letter
Luck, Alfred

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline

Topic Teachers: Strapping

Viewpoint
Parents should not expect teachers to strap a child. Our society is producing a large number of ineffective parents who are indifferent to children.

2093
Star
Toronto
80 04 30
Inches 020
Words 1000
418

Letter
Ruschin, Velma

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Strap Is Called No Deterrent

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
If pain is an effective deterrent then why not use it on other segments of society. Silencing a child by fear will just make him more hostile.

2087
Star
Toronto
80 04 30
Inches 001
Words 0050
419

Letter
Rosen, Helen

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Abdicating Responsibility

Topic Parents: Strapping

Viewpoint
Parents who advocate the teachers should use the strap are inviting an outside party to commit child abuse.

Paper/Date/Coverage Source/Ed./Wire/Letter	Place of Event	Headline	Topic and Viewpoint APRIL 1980
1926 Sun Toronto 80 04 23 Inches 012 Words 0600 261	Editorial McKenzie, Porter	Ontario Level: Public School	Headline The Perils of Co-Education	Topic Schools: Strapping Viewpoint Strapping can only be beneficial in all-male schools. Dangerous traumatic humiliation if used in front of girls.
2168 Times Brampton 80 04 28 Inches 009 Words 0450 467	Report Hogan, Al	Peel Board Level: Elementary	Headline Education Update: Debate On Corporal Punishment	Topic Boards: Strapping Viewpoint Trustees argue over policy to retain strapping.

2177
Globe & Mail
Toronto
80 05 03
Inches 004
Words 0200
26

Letter
McLaren, John

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Corporal Punishment

Topic Schools: Strapping

Viewpoint
It would be well to correct the impression that civilization abhors corporal punishment: it does not. It abhors social disorder.

2178
Globe & Mail
Toronto
80 05 03
Inches 001
Words 0050
27

Letter
Vincer, Mark

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Corporal Punishment

Topic Schools: Strapping

Viewpoint
The use of the strap as a deterrent is ludicrous.

2199
Star
Toronto
80 05 06
Inches 006
Words 0300
47

Report

Peel Board
Level: Public School

Headline
Peel Keeps Strap Despite Protests

Topic Boards: Strapping

Viewpoint
Despite Mississauga Hospital's warning of the dangers of child abuse, Board continues to endorse the use of the strap.

2402
Star
Toronto
80 05 17
Inches 010
Words 0500
253

Letter
Ross, Henry

Ontario
Level: Unspecified

Headline
Teachers Who Use Strap Are Not Sadists

Topic Teachers: Strapping

Viewpoint
Students must be taught a healthy respect for rules, even if it takes the strap. In every school there is a minority that responds only to brute force.

2423
Sun
Toronto
80 05 20
Inches 013
Words 0650
271

Editorial
Currell, Harvey

Ontario
Level: Public School

Headline
Share The Rod To Help The Child

Topic Schools: Strapping

Viewpoint
The strap should be retained in school as a deterrent and an ultimate possibility. There's a lot of wisdom in old-fashioned justice.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

1. "Secondary schools in inner London differ markedly in the behaviour and attainments shown by their pupils. This was evident in
   - the children's behaviour whilst at school (as observed by us as well as reported by teachers and by the pupils themselves)
   - the regularity of their attendance,
   - the proportions staying on at school beyond the legally enforced period,
   - their success in public examinations, and
   - their delinquency rates.

2. "Although schools differed in the proportion of behaviourally difficult or low achieving children they admitted, these differences did not wholly account for the variations between schools in their pupils' later behaviour and attainment. Even when comparisons between schools were restricted to children who were quite similar in family background and personal characteristics prior to secondary transfer, marked school variations remained. This meant that children were more likely to show good behaviour and good scholastic attainments if they attended some schools than if they attended others. The implication is that experiences during the secondary school years may influence children's progress.

3. "The variations between schools in different forms of 'outcome' for their pupils were reasonably stable over periods of at least four or five years.

4. "In general, schools performed fairly similarly on all the various measures of outcome. That is, schools which did better than average in terms of the children's behaviour in school tended also to do better in terms of examination success and delinquency. There were some exceptions to this pattern, but it appeared that in most schools the different forms of success were closely connected.

5. "These differences in outcome between schools were not due to such physical factors as the size of the school, the age of the buildings, or the space available; nor were they due to broad differences in administrative status or organization.

6. "The differences between schools in outcome were systematically related to their characteristics as social institutions. Factors as varied as the degree of academic emphasis, teacher actions in lessons, the availability of incentives and rewards, good conditions for pupils, and the extent to which children were able to take responsibility were all significantly associated with outcome differences between schools. All of these factors were open to modification by the staff, rather than fixed by external constraints.

7. "Outcomes were also influenced by factors outside teachers' immediate control. The academic balance in the intakes to the schools was particularly important in this connection. Examination success tended to be better in schools with a substantial nucleus of children of at least average intellectual ability, and delinquency rates were higher in those with a heavy preponderance of the least able. Interestingly, however, while the balance of intake was significantly associated with pupil outcome, it did not appear to have any comparable influence on school functioning, as reflected in the school process measures.

8. "This effect of balance in the intake was most marked with respect to delinquency, and least important in the case of the children's observed behaviour in the classroom and elsewhere about the school.

9. "The association between the combined measure of overall school process and each of the measures of outcome was much stronger than any of the associations with individual process variables. This suggests that the cumulative effect of these various social factors was considerably greater than the effect of any of the variables on their own. The implication is that the individual actions or measures may combine to create a particular ethos, or set of values, attitudes and behaviours which will become characteristic of the school as a whole.

10. "The total pattern of findings indicates the strong probability that the associations between school process and outcome reflect in part a causal process. In other words, to an appreciable extent children's behaviour and attitudes are shaped and influenced by their experiences at school, and, in particular, by the quality of the school as a social institution.

"Our finding that secondary schools varied greatly with respect to rates of examination success, attendance, misbehaviour and delinquency is entirely in keeping with the evidence from other research. However, our investigation has taken matters a stage further by showing that these differences were not explicable in terms of the children's characteristics prior to secondary transfer. Rather, they stemmed from experiences during the secondary school years."

"The pattern of connections is complex. It is nevertheless clear that within this network, schools have a considerable degree of choice in how they are organized, and that teachers have a similar choice on how they respond to the children they teach. Our results suggest that these decisions on how to respond are likely to affect the chances of the children improving in their behaviour and attainments.... It is not argued that schools are the most important influence on children's progress, and we agree that education cannot compensate for the inequities of society. Nevertheless, we do suggest that schools constitute an major area of influence, and one that is susceptible to change."

[Rutter, M. et al., "Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children" (1979)]

SCHOOL PROCESSES: Associations and Outcomes

	School Outcomes			
	Attendance	Behaviour	Academic	Delinquency
ACADEMIC EMPHASIS				
1. Homework observed during 1st year lessons	.40	.76*	.41	.42
2. Homework as reported by 3rd year Maths and English teachers	.49	.46	.61*	.32
3. Teachers' setting of homework checked	.49	.16	.52*	.50*
4. % of 3rd year class expected to gain 'O' level in English and Maths	.37*	.18	.35*	.22
5. Children's work displayed on walls	.34	.17	.50*	.42
6. Total teaching time per week	.63*	.06	.35	.46
7. Head teacher's reported pastoral emphasis (negative correlation)	.38	.60*	.20	.45
8. Children's reported use of school library	.52*	.43	.64*	.53*
9. Group or supervised course planning	.66*	.14	.35	.78*
10. Teachers teaching own subject only (negative relationship)	.40	.67*	.28	.67*
TEACHER ACTION IN LESSONS				
11. Teacher 'on topic'	.39	.72*	.14	.50
12. Teacher 'on equipment'	.30	.62*	.20	.47
13. % lessons ending early—3rd year	.58*	.58*	.57*	.52
14. Disciplinary intervention—3rd year lessons	.10	.66*	.18	.13
15. Disciplinary intervention—1st year lessons	.06	.55*	.41	-.05
16. Silence—3rd year lessons	.37	.60*	.19	.23
17. Interaction style—3rd year lessons	.50*	.52*	.52*	.32
PUNISHMENT				
18. Pupils told off by the Head (negative relationship)	.59*	.26	.49	.48
19. Group based discipline standards	.17	.47	.64*	.62*
20. Number of detentions	.15	.03	-.27	.47
21. Number of lines or extra work given	.41	.04	.03	.62*
22. Corporal punishment (negative relationship)	.04	.48	.44	.22
23. Ten Naughty Children scale	.11	.61*	.04	.50
REWARDS				
24. % of children named for work in assembly	.32	.76*	.37	.30
25. % 'topic' praise in lessons	.39	.76*	.34	.87*
5. Children's work displayed on walls	.34	.17	.50*	.42
26. Pupils receiving prizes for sport	.52*	.08	.22	.13
27. Pupils receiving prizes for work	.02	.34	-.06	-.10
PUPIL CONDITIONS				
28. Proportion of children who would consult teacher about personal problems	.52*	.29	.69*	-.05
29. Number of outings	-.04	.44	.55*	-.22
30. Pupil conditions scale	.21	.37	.59*	.07
31. School decorations and care of buildings	.02	.64*	.32	.12
32. Teachers report seeing pupils at any time	.27	.64*	.32	.29
33. No. of children seen in previous 2 weeks	-.02	.31*	.28	.28

SCHOOL PROCESSES: Associations and Outcomes

	School Outcomes			
	Attendance	Behaviour	Academic	Delinquency
RESPONSIBILITIES and PARTICIPATION				
34. Proportion of children who had been form captain (or equivalent)	.37	.64*	.78*	.35
35. Pupils caring for their own resources	.51*	.72*	.27	.80*
36. Participation in assembly or house /year meeting	.22	.63*	.62*	.25
37. Contributions to charity	.52*	.48	.17	.38
STAFF ORGANIZATION				
9. Group planning of syllabus	.66*	.14	.35	.78*
43. Pattern of decision making	.37	.64*	.57*	.45
44. Representation of views	.36	.09	.51*	.28
45. Other staff aware of teacher lateness	.53*	-.03	-.01	.32
46. Adequate clerical help	.27	.61*	.19	.47
3. Checks on homework setting	.49	.16	.52*	.50

[Rutter, M. et al., "Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and their Effects on Children" (1979)]

Reference

Derek Wright, The Psychology of Moral Behaviour (1971)

(1) On staff/student relationships

"If we wanted to know the nature of moral education going on in any school, our best strategy would be to seek the answers to five questions: What is the nature of the relationships between staff and pupils? What actions are rewarded or positively reinforced? What actions are punished or negatively reinforced? What is the nature of the example set by staff? What kind of talking goes on in relation to morality?

The importance of staff/pupil relationships is obvious. If they are characterized by mutual hostility or indifference, the school may be actually encouraging antisocial behaviour. If their most salient features are power and control on the part of the teacher and fear and submission on the part of the pupils, then what the pupils will be learning is discretion and the avoidance of being found out, but not self-control. The more internalized moralities of the conscientious and autonomous characters depend upon relationships of mutual liking and democratic equality.

The relationship between teacher and pupil considerably influences the effectiveness of the teacher as a source of reinforcement and example. Here the important thing is how this reinforcement and example are actually seen by the pupil, and this may not coincide with what teachers intend. It is obviously possible for a school to encourage obsequious time-serving, lying, snobbery and conceit, and to discourage truthfulness and integrity without the staff having any clear idea about the fact.

(2) On school punishment, student self-control and the example of the teacher

"School punishment is unlikely to lead to increased self-control in the child unless he has sufficient affection for the teacher to be partly on his side (though it will make him more careful about being found out); and if this affection exists the teacher's disappointment and disapproval are likely to be sanction enough. Of all sanctions corporal punishment is the least effective in encouraging moral restraint in the offender, and it may have certain negative effects. If the teacher is mainly concerned with deterring others, however, there may

be some point in such punishment. The evidence suggests that others can be vicariously conditioned by seeing an offender punished. Of course, if in their view the punishment is unjust, or if there is in the school an unspoken norm which defines the staff as the enemy, then the effect will be different.

Punishment of offenders is probably the least important factor, especially since many punishable offences at school have only tenuous moral implications. Much more important is the example set by the teacher. Obviously he will be a respectable citizen and not a criminal. But he faces a certain occupational hazard (which others face, though usually to a lesser extent). Through his authority he can control the child's response to his own behaviour. It is possible for a teacher to be rude to a child in ways in which he would not dare to be to an adult--his authority protects him from the social feedback which would otherwise inhibit him. A teacher can imperceptibly slide into the habit of more or less continually setting an example of bad manners, injustice, bullying, or even mild sadism, without knowing it, for the children have been trained to inhibit the responses which would bring home to the teacher the real nature of his conduct. I am not suggesting of course that this often happens. The important point is that because of the role that he occupies in the classroom the teacher is unlikely to be fully aware of the nature of the example he is setting."

(3) <u>On self-concept and self-control</u>

"Finally we should look carefully at the kind of self-concept our education develops in children. When people's self-esteem is reduced their moral controls are weakened. This raises the interesting question of the extent to which the damage done to self-esteem by academic failure in the classroom has repercussions in the child's moral life outside it. Schools commonly hold up two identities before the child, the positive one (the 'good boy') which includes politeness to staff, hard work, cheerfulness, obedience, cooperation, and so on, and the negative one (the 'bad boy') made up of the opposites of these. It sometimes seems that children who fail to qualify for the positive identity, however much they try, end up by opting wholeheartedly for the negative one--if they cannot have fame in a competition in which the odds seem weighted against

them they will have notoriety instead. Children only have an incentive to live up to the high opinion of their teachers if these teachers have a high opinion of them. Distrust is no cure for untrustworthiness--it merely increases it. Likewise being unsympathetic to children who lack sympathy for others is not likely to make them more sympathetic."

(4) On moral actions of the teacher

"The first step for anyone who has to take responsibility for the moral education of children should be to examine the morality of his own actions toward them. Children become moral by living in a community in which honesty and generosity are values, which is just and which therefore supports and encourages protest against injustice which may occur within it."

(5) On moral structures within the school

"Presumably schools are never actually intended to encourage the amoral character. But they may do so inadvertently, especially if moral development is not thought to be their concern. Sometimes, perhaps because of dissension among the staff and the stress of coping with impossibly difficult children, the school's morale can sink so low that on balance its moral influence is more harmful than good, so that, for example, flattery is always rewarded and expedience invariably takes precedence over justice. The conformist character would tend to be fostered by a school in which children are herded together in large groups all the time and where opportunity to form individual friendships is minimal. If the staff are distant and ineffective, and follow a laissez-faire policy, the child ends up by being influenced mainly by peer groups in which the influence of adults is totally absent. It is not difficult to picture the kind of school which encourages the authoritarian character. The staff are remote and powerful people. In the child's eyes the principal virtue is obedience to authority. Hierarchy runs all through the school, with great emphasis upon the powers and privileges of older pupils and staff. The main lesson the child learns is that as you gain power so the rules become more adjusted to suit your pleasure and convenience, and they increasingly enable you to make use of others. Relationships of mutual respect are rare and tend to be restricted to those at the bottom of the hierarchy."

(6) On the kind of school which fosters moral development

"The view taken here is of course that the character most worthy of cultivation is the altruistic-autonomous. Though developmentally speaking this must be an achievement of adulthood, school life may facilitate its emergence. The kind of school most likely to encourage it is one in which pupils and staff come from varied backgrounds and where there is plenty of opportunity for individual relationships to flourish, both among pupils and between pupils and staff. Relationships of this kind provide the child with an experience of the interhuman, of trust and creative personal exchange, which makes the point of moral principles seem obvious, and they form the context in which he can talk out his own moral problems and experience giving them shape and meaning...What he needs to find in staff is unanimity over the importance of commitment to basic moral principles coupled with diversity of judgement over their application. Democratic moments between staff and pupils are common. What the child learns is that moral issues are of the greatest importance, that they are controversial, and that they can only be settled by reasoning and appeal to common values and never by the exercise of authority and power. And he also learns that, though he has no alternative but to live by his own standards, these standards are relative and partial, and always in need of revision.